

(a) the funds allocated to Kerala for agricultural development during 1989-90 and 1990-91;

(b) the actual amount utilised by the Government of Kerala;

(c) whether the Government of Kerala has sought additional funds during the current financial year; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) and (b). The outlay approved and expenditure incurred under Agriculture and Allied Activities Sector in the State's Annual Plans 1989-90 and 1990-91 are as under:

	<i>(Rs. in lakhs)</i>	
	1989-90	1990-91
Approved outlay	6910	8597
Actual expenditure/Revised outlay	7607	7914

(c) and (d). For 1991-92, the Planning Commission have approved a relative higher outlay of Rs. 13731 lakhs for Agricultural and Allied Activities Sector in the State plan. No request for allocation of additional funds has been received from the State Government during the current financial year by the Planning Commission.

[*Translation*]

Growth Rate of Bihar

4752. SHRI RAM BADAN: Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether the growth rate of Bihar is very low as compared to other States:

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) the overall growth rate of various States during the last three financial years; and

(d) the steps contemplated to increase the growth rate of Bihar;

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) The growth rate of Bihar has been lower than those of a number of other States.

(b) Growth rates differ among States for a variety of reasons, some among them being the historically uneven development of the infrastructure, industry and entrepreneurship, and the year to year variations in rainfall and the consequent drought and floods.

(c) The State-wise growth rate of net state domestic product during 1987-88 to 1989-90 is given in the attached statement.

(d) Bihar State has been implementing development Plans for increasing the growth rate. These Plans include investments/outlays for the development of infrastructure, industry, agriculture, irrigation, rural development, education, health, etc. and also implementation of direct employment generation programmes to increase the income of poor people.

STATEMENT

Percentage change in Net State Domestic Product over the previous year at constant prices.

S. No.	State/U.T.	1987-88	1988-89 (P)	1989-90 (Q)
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	9.19	9.9	4.11
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	5.25	6.71	.33
3.	Assam	5.5	2.02	11.3
4.	Bihar	- 6.11	8.71	- 3.78
5.	Goa	6.45	4.72	4.74
6.	Gujarat	- 8.59	37.94	1.45
7.	Haryana	- 2.07	24.22	3.06
8.	Himachal Pradesh	- 0.89	7.45	11.00*
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	—
10.	Karnataka	5.14	10.58	3.59

S. No.	State/U.T.	1987-88	1988-89 (P)	1989-90 (Q)
1	2	3	4	5
11.	Kerala	2.58	7.94	5.51
12.	Madhya Pradesh *	14.95	8.69	0.1
13.	Maharashtra	8.16	9.22	9.99
14.	Manipur	6.51	5.76	- 0.33
15.	Meghalaya	9.05	4.97	3.09
16.	Nagaland	10.77	11.45	—
17.	Orissa	- 1.44	14.95	6.03
18.	Punjab	4.93	5.63	9.26
19.	Rajasthan	- 6.88	45.77	- 2.9
20.	Sikkim	29.63	—	—
21.	Tamil Nadu	5.34	5.23	- 0.01

S. No.	State/U.T.	1987-88	1988-89 (P)	1988-90 (Q)
1	2	3	4	5
22.	Tripura	8.35	6.41	7.3
23.	Uttar Pradesh	3.11	9.09	3.25
24.	West Bengal	3.08	4.39	4.82
25.	Delhi	—	—	—
26.	Pondicherry	4.74	0.7	2.04
	All India (Net National Product)	3.99	11.24	5.17

Q : Quick Estimates

P: Provisional

— : Not available (The figures have not been supplied by the concerned State Governments).

• : Based on old (1970-71) series.

Source: Directorate of Economics & Statistics of respective State Governments.

Note 1: Owing to differences in source material used the figures for different States/ UTs. are not strictly comparable.

Note 2: The state of Mizoram prepared these estimates at current prices only.

Note 3: The UTs. of Andaman & Nicobar Island, Chandigarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep do not prepare these estimates.

Note 4: All India estimates of Net National Product are compiled independently by Central Statistical Organisation and cannot be derived as total of individual State/UT estimates.